

Subject: O, A summary report of interviews of 25 August 1964, 4 Sep 1964 and 15 Sep 1964

Date : 16 Sep 1964

-I-

ALMA-ATA

DECLASSIFIED AND RELEASED BY  
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY  
SOURCE METHOD EXEMPTION 3B2B  
NAZI WAR CRIMES DISCLOSURE ACT  
DATE 2007

1. End Sept 1963 after Subject's arrival by plane from Vienna to Moscow she proceeded at once with her group to ALMA-ATA where she stayed till Mid-Nov 1963. Subject was present at the opening ceremony in Alma-Ata and had a chance to exchange a few generalities with Madam FURTSEVA. The latter impressed her as a very energetic, rather masculine type of woman, with determination and brains. At the opening Subject had also had her first "accident" with Soviet "pinpricks" against her. A Soviet female administrator who was supposed to help the American group gave Subject a glass of cognac after which she fainted and had to be helped by colleagues to her room. Although Subject had before one champagne and one wine she thought that there must have been "something" in cognac.

Subject did not remember the administrator's name, she described her as quite dark attractive, blonde, aged 35, quite impudent and ruthless. She was one of "helpers" attached by Soviet authorities to the American staff. In Subject's opinion they all were probably KGB agents. Altogether about 10 of them, the majority pretending to be common laborers. It was obvious, however, even at the first glance that they were intelligent, educated, and trained people and moreover so when they turned out to be able to intelligently discuss graphics, painting, and art in general. From the very beginning they started to work on American personnel. Thus a man called Romeo, lnu, aged 27, Russian, 6'1, wavy hair, square face, of athletic built because of which he was better known as "Tarzan" - tried to get on intimate terms with

*Orig to RID/HR for info  
cc in 52p...*

*16 Sept 1964*

Subject and her girls, and pretended even to Subject to be of Ukrainian origin. He had no luck with Subject but was quite successful with a colleague of her - Anna - another guide who finally had to be sent back to the States. Anna fell in love with Tarzan, wanted to remain with him in the Soviet Union, and began to inform him on other girls and boys of American group.

A "somewhat" different story happened to another colleague of Subject:

John BENNET of 6126 S.E. Stephens,  
Portland 15, Og.

*Travelled in Sov. Union with  
Art. Exhibited in late 1963.*

He was approached by a sexy blonde divorcee of Russian nationality and one evening was caught in "compromising situation" with her in a park in Alma-Ata. Brought to militia or KGB office he was first threatened and then proposed to work for Sovs. He was promised girls, special apartment for himself, money etc. They worked on him the whole night through and released him only early in the morning. After his return BENNET reported all to his chief and was immediately returned via Moscow to the States. He was one of most capable guides - intelligent, sociable, a good piano-player, and above all an excellent debator.

2. Already on the first day of public Exposition Subject met a few Ukrainians. Then he met <sup>also</sup> some who came from other places in Kazakhstan. Her impression from what she ~~was~~ and was told:

The Ukrainian element in Alma-Ata and vicinity was numerous and strong. Together with Russians they <sup>were</sup> prevailing over Kazakhs. Among Ukrainians there were many from Western Ukraine mostly former deportees. Subject met also many Ukrainian students, again many of them from Western Ukraine who arrived on Virgin Lands scheme. Relations between Ukrainians and Kazakhs are bad, unfriendly, and tense. According to some Ukrainians, Kazakhs hated Ukrainians even more than Russians. One of reasons at least: the Ukrainian element became the main competitor as fruit-producer with whom Kazakhs were unable to cope. "Solid Ukrainian hut surrounded by a well kept garden" was the main target of Kazakhs' hate.

*Confirmed by Soviet and returned to U.S. before time expired copyright.*

Russians were more in sight in the city where they had to do with "educated Kazakhs". At least according to TERNOMykola most of them (Educated Kazakhs) were quite pro-Soviet as they appreciated "civilization". Consequently, some Ukrainians preferred to use in public Russian in order not to irk "additionally" Kazakhs.

The Ukrainian sentiments are very strong and Subject described the Ukrainian element as patriotic. Many were keenly interested in Ukrainian affairs, goings of Ukrainian emigration in the USA, asked for Ukrainian religious and other books. Often they complained against being "doubly persecuted by Russians and Kazakhs. Ukrainian students complained that they were usually hated by their Kazakh colleagues and also had to face obstacles from Russians.

3. Late 1962 or early 1963 there was a massacre of "strikers" near Alma-Ata. According to two Sources, one of whom is listed in part "IA", about 10,000 people among them many Ukrainians, died at that time in mountains near Alma-Ata. Out of discontent against the lack of proper facilities, and very bad working conditions, mostly newcomers to Kazakhstan, <sup>they</sup> decided to strike and began marching to Alma-Ata. On their way they were intercepted by some troops, forced into a valley, and machinegunned.

The same information was told HUNENKOS ( husband and wife, both in US group, too) by their uncle in Alma-Ata who is a party-member).

---

-I A -

Soviet Individuals Subject Met in Alma-Ata d.v.b. cc 1963 USSR

1. ~~X~~ TERNO, Mykola (Nikola) Naumovich of

Alma-Ata,

Prospekt Lenina 103, don 3, kv. 25.

Ukrainian, single, party-member, aged 31, 5'11, dark blond, blue deeply  
set eyes, rather thin straight nose (See picture); speaks very slowly, knows  
beside Ukrainian and Russian, Czech, learns Kazakh and Sorbian. Very gay, has  
sense of humor. Seems to be industrious, full determination, almost ruthless.  
TERNO carries some sort of special party-certificate ~~with~~ which "everything is open  
to him and he can walk around everywhere in the mountains". Originally from POLTAVA, Ukr-  
aino, since two years in Alma Ata, <sup>since 1962 or 1961</sup> on a party assignment, after his arrival to  
Alma-Ata was secretary of Komsomol obkom or kraikom, at the present - "professor"  
of Marxism-Leninism in Alma-Ata Institute, planned to get a transfer back to  
Ukraine.

Shortly before Subject left Alma Ata (mid-Nov 1963) TERNO was beaten up  
by some people in the countryside near Alma-Ata. One day he came with a bandaged wound  
on his head and consequently should have a scar on the left side. He refused to  
explain how it happened and jokingly replied that probably he was beaten up  
because of Subject by his "Kazakh rivals".

TERNO told Subject that he planned to visit the USA in 1964 or 1965  
provided he won't be taken into Army for 6 months at that time, on some special  
secret project.

TERNO'S parents are simple peasants living near POLTAVA, Ukr SSR. His brother  
is a common worker, married, in POLTAVA, too.

In 1963, a few months prior to Subject's arrival in the Soviet Union,  
TERNO travelled to CSR. He also mentioned visiting some other satellite countries  
but no Western ones.

TERNO approached Subject at the Exposition and soon they became friends.  
They met quite often, almost every second day. In the beginning they argued much

about capitalism versus communism, modern art against socialist realism also. (N.B. From Subject told C. might be inferred that she was <sup>probably</sup> on quite ~~intimate~~ friendly terms with Terno.) Twice she saw Terno in MOSCOW after Alma-Ata whereto he came on official business, once to expedite his transfer to the Ukraine and second time to participate in some plenum of the CCof CPSU.

Subject described TERN0 as a communist idealist with strong Ukrainian feelings. She called him a patriotic Ukrainian and particularly stressed his anti-Russian sentiments. One day he told Subject that he was fed up with Soviet system, complained about Russian oppression of Ukrainians, lack of freedom etc. On the other hand he was also very critical of capitalism. He also warned Subject to be careful in her expressions when meeting "all kind of people". His final goal - as he told Subject - is to achieve as high a position in the party as only possible in order to be able to better serve his own people in the future. When Subject asked him ~~then~~ whether, for example, he would denounce her on some illegal business if this would help him in his career, his answer was - "Of course, I would do it, moreover that nothing serious would happen to you, you would be only expelled but I would considerably promote my cause". He said it half-jokingly but Subject had no doubt that he really would do so. Also on other occasions he ~~made~~ made it quite clear that in striving to his goal "he was calm but determined ~~and~~ ruthless". His party ca/reer he justified morally as a means to help his nation in the future. In his view only communism has a future, no matter whether it's good or bad from one or the other point of view and whatever its distortions at the present. Therefore people like him have to be in if they want to achieve something, both - personally and in serving their compatriots. "We should not leave everything for Russians" was his conclusion.

TERN0 contributes to local and national papers but not much. He promised to write down his critique of emigration for Subject but then changed his mind. In his view, emigration was no good because it left the homeland. They should have stayed at home and try to improve matters together with the entire nation.

On many occasions he called emigrants servants of Germans, fascists, traitors; on other occasions he was more sympathetic toward emigration and even appreciated its actions, in general.

Subject talked with TERNO also about young Ukrainian poets and writers and he usually praised them. He did not know them personally but was familiar with their writings. Subject mentioned to him that she would like to meet some of them and for example named DRACH and KOSTENKO, and TERNO thought this was a good idea.

(N.B. In Moscow DRACH, Ivan told Subject that the KGB told him prior to her arrival in Moscow that they knew from a young man in ALMA ATA that Subject wanted to see him. She thought it was TERNO who informed about it the KGB directly or indirectly.)

TERNO was given by Subject "Pravda Kobzaria" by Barka, "Kreidiane kolo" and "Suchasnist". He also used to read a lot from "Ukrainian Encyclopedia" exhibited at the Exposition. His opinion about Barka's book was negative - "too much mysticism" - but he asked for more of "Suchasnist". Reading one article on some Soviet problem in "Suchasnist" he commented with approval: "I wonder how the hell you get all these facts about us". From "Kreidiane Kolo" he read one or two verses and said that he did not like it at all. Referring to Barka's book ~~Subject~~ TERNO asked Subject if she could tell him something more about "Prolog". When added that he knew about "this organization that publishes books like that one". Subject replied that she knew only that "Prolog" was publishing books in Ukrainian and English.

TERNO was introduced by Subject also to HUNENKOS and they spent some time together, too. In Hunenkos' opinion TERNO is a Ukrainian and a communist and it is difficult to say "whether more communists or more Ukrainian".

Subject wrote to TERNO from Europe and from here but so far had no letter from him.

2. ~~HAPPIJ~~ (HAPIJ) Yaroslav Stepanovich of d.o.b ca 1918

Dzezkazhan - 1,

ul. Bulvar Kosma, dom 27, kvartira  
Karhandinskaya obl.  
Kazakhskaya SSR

aged 40-45, but looked like 55-60, Ukrainian from Western Ukraine, former prisoner of German and Soviet concentration camps, both times for "Underground literature", has 2 or 3 children, peasant; asked Subject to convey his greetings and address to his ~~brother in Boston, Mass;~~ to HAPIJ Yuri Mykolaevich  
7 Greanley Place,  
Jamaica Plain 30, Mass.

HAPPIJ approached first HUNENKOS. He told Subject about the massacre near Alma-Ata, in 1963.

3. Bohdan, lny ( Subject forgot his name) and his Russian friend.

Bohdan was the first one who approached Subject at the Exposition. He spoke Ukrainian and invited Subject and her friends (HUNENKOS) to his room in the hotel. He was a geologist, Ukrainian from Western Ukraine, single, aged 30, son of a Ukrainian catholic priest who died, his mother lived in Lviv. 5'5, slim, dark brown hair combed on side, oval face, grey-brown eyes, straight nose. Intelligent, with "deep philosophical approach to everything" and some inclination to dramatization. At that time he stayed in ALMA ATA together with a geological research group. Subject knew him for about 4 or 5 days. He came <sup>very</sup> day to the Exposition and was very much interested in Ukrainian affairs, asked many questions about activities of Ukrainian emigration, complained against Russification and the situation in the Ukraine in general.

One evening (the last one on which she saw him for the last time) Subject went with HUNENKOS to his room. Bohdan and his friend were giving a small party with a few drinks and zakuskas. Bohdan became very sentimental and began to complain in strong terms against Russian oppression, lack of freedom, his own life etc. His Russian friend tried to calm him down but in vain. Subject was to meet him next day again ~~in~~ <sup>in</sup> his room.

When she came next evening she was told by dezhurna that "both citizens" were no longer at the hotel and where they ~~left~~ no one knew.

Subject thought that Bohdan and his friend went into trouble because of his expressions last <sup>night</sup> ~~time~~ and was probably arrested by the KGB. They probably had listening devices in the hotel.

At one of first meetings with Bohdan Subject gave him "Panorama" by Kosholivets and he was delighted with the book.

Bohdan's Russian friend was also a geologist, former inmate (for 15 years) of Soviet concentration camps released after Stalin's death, aged 45 but looked like 45, very much like Dick Tracy, well dressed in somewhat American fashion, very tactful, croocut, grey hairs, had a beautiful strong tenor and played guitar, used to have a drink before singing and playing. To Bohdan he was more like an elder brother or father. He seemed to be very much concerned about him. At one time he was living in the Ukraine and had a strong fondness for everything Ukrainian. Particularly he liked Ukrainian music and songs. His manners were like those of an aristocrat.

He knew a great many songs from concentration camps, many of his own make, and he promised to write them down for Subject. He wanted that those songs will be brought by Subject abroad.

4. Bohdan, lnu, student of Medical Alma Ata Institute, Ukrainian, aged 28, blond, strongly built, looked like a boxer, son of an orthodox priest from Central Ukraine. Complained that Russians were oppressing Ukrainians and other non-Russians, that they were using Kazakhs against Ukrainians, and that Ukrainian students had many obstacles at the University from both Russians and Kazakhs. He also complained about bad living conditions of students in general.

Bohdan had a Russian friend - Ivan - who invited Subject and H<sub>u</sub>nenkos to his house. Ivan's mother was a professor at the <sup>A</sup>Alma Ata Medical Institute, Russian, "cultured" an old intelligent lady. They talked about life in the States and in the Soviet Union. Ivan went once in recent years to England and seemed to be quite impressed

-9-

by life in the West.

5. A young Russian, aged 19, asked for Missals. He told Subject that he wanted to study theology but "they" did not let him do so. He complained that "agentura" tries to prevent young people to go to church, and uses their own people for priests. "They" don't mind however old people attend church. Also some other Ukrainians and Russians asked for Missals prayerbooks and crosses.

6. KOTOVENKO, fnu of

Semipalatinsk 9,  
Dom Kultury

Ukrainian, aged 29, blue eyes, long nose, oval face, strongly built, regisseur and actor, working now on organization of Ukrainian theatre in Alma Ata. He came with a group of actors and read for quite a time from "Ukrainian Encyclopedia" at the Exposition. Some pages they read with approval, some with critique, and some with artificial indignation.

KOTOVENKO told Subject that he lived in Alma-Ata but often went to ~~Palatinsk~~ Semipalatinsk where he also had his "place to live". From ~~Palatinsk~~ Semipalatinsk he wrote a short letter with greetings to Subject in Alma Ata.

7. TKACHENKO, Volodymyr of

Alma-Ata  
Auezova 138, kv.5

painter, Ukrainian, aged 45, 5(9, People's Artist, Order of Lenin, spoke Russian, married. Listened to Subject in the Shevchenko Museum in Alma Ata when she discussed with others anti-religious propaganda she noticed at the museum. Then approached her, asked about Ukrainian art abroad, invited to his house. His wife is Russian, painter. TKACHENKO seemed to be a nice honest man, <sup>one</sup> interested primarily in art. Both - very hospitable and friendly. Gave Subject ~~some~~ of his paintings and asked to send ~~pictures~~ him at least copies of some paintings from abroad. Subject introduced him to Hurenkos, too.

MOSCOW

1. Mid-Nov 1963 from Alma Ata Subject went by plane to Moscow and stayed there till mid-Jan 1964. After her arrival in Moscow she went to hotel "Ukraina" and was accommodated on 18th floor. She was alone in her room. As soon as she unpacked there was a male telephone call: "Is this Gospozha S.....?"

- "Who is talking?"

"It's not important, no need for you to know".

Such calls were repeated same day again. On following days they became even more frequent and more "enriched" in contents: "Are you still here??"

"Why don't you finally go home, why don't take the next plane and go to hell where you belong to".

At night someone knocked at her door and walls. Finally on instruction of American Director Subject <sup>had</sup> to move to another room where she joined two of her colleagues. Afterwards the calls and knocks stopped.

During a "hot debate" at the Exposition deliberately provoked by some young agitators Subject was called "nationalist", "fashist", "banderovka" also. Why didn't she live in the Ukraine when she cared so much for Ukrainian people, why did she come Moscow asf.

At the GUM in Moscow Subject had one day another incident - one of three men who followed her in a car to the GUM went with her inside and tried to snatch her handbag. He failed.

Her bags and those of her colleagues were "regularly" checked by some people. One day they almost caught redhandedly dizhurna "inspecting" their valises.

2. In Dec 1963, about two weeks after Subject was introduced to DRACH, Ivan she was given "something" with his food at the hotel and became very ill at night. Dizhurna called at once ambulance and Subject was delivered to a hospital (for foreigners) in Moscow. She arrived there unconscious.

She was proposed to undergo an operation of liver but refused to. Subject was even afraid to take medicine. On second day came her Director and wanted to take her to American Doctor ~~from~~ at the US Embassy. Soviet Doctor refused to release Subject under the pretext that this might have serious consequences for her health. Finally after 4 days she was released from Soviet hospital.

In the hospital Subject was treated by Dr VOLFSON Alexandr Savelovich who gave Subject his address as : Moscow, ul. Sadovo-Kudrinskaya dom N 19, kw.27.  
approx.

He was ~~70~~ 70 years old, of aristocratic family, when talking about life in the West tried to convince Subject that communism was better than capitalism. Subject met there also two or three ~~nurses~~ nurses who were quite interested in Western way of life, fashions, aso.

Subject stayed alone in her room with empty 8 beds while she saw some patients accommodated in the corridor.

3. While in Moscow Subject received one day from SAMBOR, Western Ukraine a telegram about the death of her grandfather, a catholic priest who after his return from Siberia where he spent 10 years, had lived with his relatives in Sambor. ( Subject has there her uncle and some other relatives.)

She went to the Vice-Director of the group who, however, was afraid that this might be just a trap set up for Subject. Finally, he agreed to let her go to SAMBOR provided she will be accompanied by some other guide. HUNENKOS were willing to go with Subject but it turned out to be quite expensive for 3 persons. On the other hand, Alexandr H. was against letting his wife Maria to go alone with Subject. In the end another male colleague of Subject volunteered to accompany her. They bought tickets and had everything ready except for final permission from OVIR.

At 17.00 hrs same day when they planned to leave for Sambor Subject went to OVIR being sure that she will face no new obstacles. She was wrong, however. ~~Major~~ A major aged approx. 50, Russian, told her that she was denied the permission because Sambor was closed to foreigners. Subject protested in very strong words, called him worse than Hitler, attacked the whole Soviet system, told the major that they were

inhuman, had no conscience etc. Finally she threatened to tell all people at the Exposition how she was treated by Soviet authorities. Subject "wished" also the major that the same happened to the major if he should ever come to the Stat. The major seemed to control himself quite well but did not try to calm her down. After 10 to 15 minutes altogether, Subject banged the door with fury and went to send a telegram to her parents in the States informing them that she was prevented from going to ~~the States~~ SAMBOR.

Later on, when in the States, Subject learned from the letter from Sambor, that her relatives tried to reach her in Moscow by telephone but were told that Subject was no longer at the hotel.

4. Prior to the incident with Sambor, Subject tried to get a permission to go to Lviv. She was refused to without any explanation.

5. At the Exposition in Moscow at one time a young man threw some sketches in one of the halls. The American guide threw it back. It was an obvious provocation. This was not, however, in Subject's department.

6. While in Moscow Subject was approached at the Exposition by many Ukrainian artists and students. Some of them came just for that purpose from Kiev and Lviv - to see and talk to Subject. They all asked questions about Ukrainian emigration and told her bits of information about the Ukraine, but only in general terms. Most of students stressed Russification, influx of Russian element into Ukraine, deliberate obstacles to development of Ukrainian culture. From what she was told Subject thought Lviv and Kiev were main centers of Ukrainian patriotic youth. Thus, in Lviv at one time, in recent years, students openly protested against lecturing in Russian. Also in Lviv and in Kiev students had their "circles" (kruzhky) in which they read "zakhalavna" poems and other literature and "exchanged views". These groups had, however, ~~had~~ nothing in common with any sort of armed underground as it existed in 1940's and 1950'.

Subject was also told that ~~old~~ young people of all nationalities had a great fondness for all American and ridiculed anti-American propaganda.

Some Ukrainian students from Lviv asked Subject for Ukrainian books printed abroad.

- II A -

Sovs Subject met in Moscow

1. DRACH, Ivan of Moscow

After 3 or 4 weeks of her stay in Moscow Subject met DRACH. She was introduced to him by ROMANETS' , Volodymyr , a Ukrainian student from Kiev in Moscow. ROMANETS' address in Moscow: Moscow (Center ) , Petrovericheskiy Pereulok 6/8; in Kiev: Kiev 74, vul. Velyka Mostytska (ul. Bolshaya Mostitskaya) No 28.

Subject met ROMANETS at the Exposition. <sup>day</sup> One<sup>✓</sup> after a few meetings they had at the Exposition and in the city, <sup>Subject's Romanets'</sup> ~~they~~ were discussing y <sup>an</sup> Ukrainian poets and writers. ROMANETS seemed to know quite a few of them and about them and highly praised them as "molodtsi". He asked Subject whether she met already some of them for instance, Drach who is in Moscow. Subject replied that she only heard and read about them and would gladly meet Drach. ROMANETS replied that sometimes he sees Drach and he will tell him that Subject would like to see him. Some time afterwards ROMANETS told Subject that DRACH had agreed to meet her, and a meeting was arranged at a Kievskaya Metro Station in Moscow under the Shevchenko monument. It was early evening, Subject was late 10 or 15 minutes and ROMANETS who accompanied DRACH reproached her for being late "while meeting such an important person as Drach". After the introduction ROMANETS stayed for approx. 15 minutes and then left. On DRACH'S suggestion they left Metro -Station and went to Praha-Restaurant.

In the beginning DRACH was very reserved, "cool", and stuck to official line". He asked Subject what she wanted from him and who she was. He did not trust her and the first evening as well ~~on~~ as on following occasions called emigration traitors, trash etc. He also offended Subject as one of those emigrants. Finally, one evening Subject could not stand it any longer and broke in tears. DRACH suddenly completely changed and began to trust her. First of all he told her that shortly

before her arrival to Moscow he was told by "Diad'ky" from the KGB that Subject will try to meet him in Moscow. They told him they knew it from a young man in Alma-Ata. Furthermore, they instructed Drach to meet Subject and report on everything she will talk about with him. He should also take all books and other materials she will give him and then hand them over to the KGB.

DRACH told Subject that in the beginning he did not trust her because he was not sure as to whether the whole set up incl. Subject herself, was not just a trap of the KGB.

Afterwards, Subject and DRACH met almost every day. DRACH told her to give him the books and usually he took two at one time. He explained that he could manage to keep the most important <sup>ones</sup> for himself and his colleagues, particularly for DZIUBA, and only some of them he will hand over to the KGB. He stressed, for instance, that he would never give the KGB "Ukrainian Encyclopedia" or "Panorama..." by Koshelivets. Most of the books he was going to bring to Lviv, to DZIUBA.

When Subject pointed out that the KGB might find it out, DRACH replied that "they" were not as smart and powerful as they seemed to be and "could be handled, too". Anyway, his first meetings with Subject were OK from their point of view and "washed him in their eyes".

DRACH warned Subject that nevertheless she should be more careful with the people she was meeting. When she asked about ROMANETS', his reply was: "He is a good boy but one should not trust him fully". DRACH didn't want to elaborate on that but kept repeating: "one has to be always careful, don't forget it". He also told Subject that they always should meet "in open" and not to try to conceal their rendezvous. His explanation: they (KGB) will otherwise only increase their surveillance "and it will be worse for us". He was however quite skilful in taking books from Subject without being noticed.

DRACH had very little money and Subject paid all expenses in restaurants. He refused, however, to accept any money from her. Next time Subject promised to bring him from the States glasses-frames, he did not mind. From what she noticed, DRACH lives in rather poor conditions.

At the time of attacks against him and his colleagues, he usually works on translation (he gave one of two of his translations to Subject). As he knows no Western languages he has to do his translations from the rough ones made by someone else.

Physical description of Drach: Apparent age 33-35, 5'6, dark blond, loving-cup-ears, round face, wears glasses (See picture). Quite shabby clothes, seems not to care about them. At first glance looks just like any other average human being. As soon however as he opens his mouth strikes with his intelligence, wit, and strong dynamic personality. When talking becomes excited and emotional. Then he can bang his fists, gesticulate, and does not see nor care what's going on around him. He likes to talk and to be listened to, and not vice versa.

Characteristic. Of high intelligence, alert, emotional, friendly, determined. Well read in world literature and cinematography but in other fields of art, for instance, in painting and graphics lacks often even basic contemporary knowledge.

Being generally regarded as "the leader of present generation" by young Ukrainian intelligentsia he takes this position for granted and even demands to be acknowledged and respected as such. He has some very strong sense of messianic mission for his people. Here are some of his thoughts as expressed to Subject: He cannot sleep at night because he has to solve many problems. He and his ~~colleagues~~ colleagues have to push forward Ukrainian nation and culture many years and decades ahead to make it equal with other modern nations of the world. He has to write dramas, scripts, poems, make translations, debate, correspond with his colleagues, keep them together aso asf - because he is the one who feels the duty not to rest for a while in their efforts to promote the cause of their nation. In this respect he wants to follow Ivan Franko, to be one of his "homeniari".

Ivan Franko is for him everything, an ideal to be followed in all aspects. He likes Franko's sophistication, depth of thought, courage, and devotion. DRACH often uses expressions like "frankivskyi approach", "frankivskyi style" aso. Shevchenko is not his favored; on the contrary: too sentimental, too peasant-like,

too melodramatic, too little sophisticated.

DRACH is devoted to his nation. He loves it so much that more than often he has to hate and curse his compatriots because he cannot stand their backwardness, lack of national articulation, and passivism. He hates "khakhlatsvo" and cannot sleep because of it. He hates "those peasant-types without culture, sophistication, and courage"; he hates them "for their bottle and 'Rozprishayte khloptsi koni', those two symbols of 'khakhly' beyond which they never strive to get".

He finally hates "those in Moscow and Kiev who don't even move their finger in defence of their nation". He was particularly bitter about them "because if they were different they could help their younger colleagues and could do much for their own people". But again, these were just "khakhly".

But when he hates them all it is only because he loves them too much. He wants to give them culture, sense of life, courage; he wants to make modern people out of Khakhly. And only by putting Ukrainian nation on a higher level of culture, by creation of new cultural ~~values~~ values, Ukrainian people will emancipate also politically. His motto: through culture, art, and modernism to political emancipation. This is the main goal of his life.

Ukrainian cinema is dead, therefore he has to write scripts and seek new ways of expression. Ukrainian poetry is dead too - hence a new poetry is to be created, also asf.

He and his colleagues are not many, he would like to see them many more, and he would like to see more support from his people. But he is not discouraged. On the contrary, this only compels him and his colleagues to work harder and harder, to strain themselves to the utmost in order to live the strongest mark possible on the future.

Emigration is not important for him. Later, he somewhat changed his negative view, after several discussions with Subject. But nevertheless, only the ~~native~~ people in their native land are capable to do something really substantial and only they count. Sooner or later, emigration will be assimilated, allianated, and disappeared.

In his view ,the emigration overestimates its role, does not realize that they left their homeland and fled when they were most needed at home. With sarcasm he mentioned petty squabbles abroad, and complained - without mentioning any names - about those who by writing useless commentaries to "our poems" put them only in trouble. Asked on this particular topic, he stressed that he and his colleagues did not mind their works being printed abroad but without commentaries harmful to them.

His main interest in emigration is in young people , how they have solved their problems inside a foreign environment, what are they nationally, culturally, professionally. Particularly, what is their contribution to the cultural development of their countries, and what could they do for Ukrainian people. He wanted to know if and how many young Ukrainians have prominent positions in American artistic, professional, and diplomatic world, what they think and what they feel.

Subject mentioned to him several names, incl. her colleagues like BACHYNSKYI, TERSHAK, KOVETS and others but she did not think he memorized them.

He talked appreciatively about "Ukrainian Encyclopedia", he liked poems by Emma ANDIYEVSKA. Some of other poems ( Subject did not remember what exactly) he described as trash and particularly complained about bad Ukrainian language ("kostrubati ukrainska mova").

He likes modern literature and cinematography. Wanted to read "Lolita". While in Italy in 1962 he saw "La Dolce Vita". He liked it, he likes Fellini. In Italy he was in Rome and in some other cities with a group of film producers. He was delighted with Italy. Found many common features in both , Ukrainian and Italian mentality. Mentioned that in the begining "they" <sup>(authorities)</sup> ~~did not~~ did not want let him go abroad but a lady from cinematographic world had helped.

DRACH was of a very positive opinion about Ukrainian youth center in Lviv: "they think, work, and act".

His innermost circle he described as consisting of 7-8 people like DZIUBA, SWITLYCHNYI, and others. He never mentioned KOROTYCH.

His parents were illiterate peasants, his mother knew many songs and proverbs. She could also compose some songs of her own. He thinks he got his talents from her.

After Subject made friends with DIACH he behaved "more like a bachelor than a married man". Only shortly before her departure he told her that he was married. She "reproached" him for behaving otherwise but he seemed "to be used to the reputation of a Don Juan".

DRACH promised to give Subject some of his poems and translations either in Moscow after her return from Kiev, or in Kiev where he planned eventually to come at that time. In case he would not come to Kiev, Subject was to get "zakhalavna literatura" from SVITLYCHNYI in Kiev. The latter - according to Drach - kept ready not only his own works but also those of his colleagues. In Kiev Subject failed, however, to contact SVITLYCHNYI and after her return to Moscow she was afraid to send telegram to DRACH as she felt to be under strong (at least 3 men) surveillance. She also noted the number of the car that followed her one day: 72-84-61. (At that time she stayed in Moscow only for one day or so and simply had no time to otherwise arrange the meeting with DRACH.)

While in Kiev Subject came across MARCHENKO, Olexij (See report on PYTLAR Olena of 26 Aug 1964). In addition to the report on PYTLAR Subject ~~noted~~ remembered that one day in her hotel in Kiev she noticed MARCHENKO talk in the hall to a young man, approx. 30 years old, slim. When she asked MARCHENKO afterwards who he was talking to, his reply was that this was KOROTYCH. Shown the picture of KOROTYCH by C., Subject said that the man she saw with MARCHENKO looked differently. Also that MARCHENKO showed no interest in introducing her to KOROTYCH.

DRACH gave Subject a list of people she should contact in ~~Kiev~~ KIEV as he thought they were worthwhile to talk to. Two of them:

HORSKA, Alla and SVITLYCHNYI, Ivan he gave also letters of introduction ~~to the Soviet Union and to the Soviet Union.~~

On the list which was given to Subject by Drach "under the spur of the moment" his friends in K<sup>I</sup>ev are enumerated in following order:

a/ HORSKA, Alla (she is on the picture with DRACH) of

Kiev 4, wul. Repina 25, kw. 6, TEL. B (Ukrainian ~~5~~) 5-80-39, Ukrainian, female, sculptor and painter, in Drach's opinion one of the best, married, her husband should be a rather "nasty type" unwilling to work;

Alla is a very good friend of Drach. Subject telephoned her in Kiev, a manly voice answered but refused to talk. Subject did not go to her address as she was under surveillance and was afraid to visit anyone at his home.

b/ KOTSIUBYNSKA, Mykhailyna - Ukrainian, female, artist, no address, just telephone: B - 5-45-47. Subject phoned her but there was no answer.

c/ KOSTENKO, Lina of Kiev 42, Bulvar Chkalova 8 b, kv.20 (No telephone), Ukrainian, female. Subject did not try to contact Kostenko. According to Drach, Kostenko is one of strongest poets. She lives rather isolated after "recent" separation from her husband.

d/ SVITLYCHNYI, Ivan Ol. to be contacted through SWERSTIUK, Yevhen (see 'c'). Drach was full of praise for SVITLYCHNYI who should be very impressive, serious man; a ladies man, has a deep philosophical approach to everything. "A great man and a wonderful friend" - as Drach put it. He recommended very warmly to meet SVITLYCHNYI. Moreover, SVITLYCHNYI was the one from whom Subject was supposed to get "zakhalavna" literature to be smuggled out abroad.

Subject phoned SWERSTIUK at his office but was told that he was not there. Subject could not figure out whether he was not employed there or just was out that day.

e/ SWERSTIUK, Yevhen of im.  
Kiev, vul. A Lenina, Instytut Psykholohiyi, near Univermag,  
Tel. B 4 - 80-37

- private address: Kiev, STARONAVODNYTS'KA No 25.

Subject did not remember what Drach told her about SWERSTIUK except for giving him as a contact to SVITLYCHNYI.

f/ HAVRYLENKO, Hrysha (Hryhorly) of

Kiev, vul. Chkalova 24, kv.95

- Ukrainian, male, graphic

g/ KRAMICH, fnu - Ukrainian young artist, in Kiev

h/ PARIUK, Les' - young regisseur, Ukrainian, male, very talented, highly praised by Drach.

Eventually also: i/ DONCHENKO, Lesia, Ukrainian, female, employee of the Museum of Ukrainian Art in Kiev.

Mostly praised by Drach was, however, DZIUBA, Ivan of Lviv.

j/ DZIUBA - in Drach's opinion the best critic Ukrainians have nowadays, his "dear friend and very courageous", TBC-ill, spent some time in TB Sanatorium. Lives with his wife in Lviv, was supposed to come to Kiev in connection with preparations for Shevchenko-celebrations. Drach recommended him highly to be talked to.

From purely professional, artistic point of interest Drach recommended to meet in Lviv, West Ukraine:

aa/ MYT, Teodoziya, Ukrainian, female, a very good sculptor (all the others in Lviv Drach described as 'weak').

bb/ YAKUTOVYCH, fnu Ukrainian graphic, made many illustrations, among them, also for "Pata Morgana" by Kotsiubynskyi and for "Zemla" by Kobylanska.

aaa/ DRACH told Subject that he was maintaining contact with

KRAWCHUK, Petro of  
1164 Dundas Ave, Toronto 3, Ont., Canada,

Ukrainian communist whom he described "a servile bandit". KRAWCHUK has a strong influence in Moscow and Kiev and is trusted by the regime-people. He is nevertheless quite useful for DRACH because through him Drach can get any literary Western work he asks for.

According to Drach, KRAWCZUK is "Hanko Terlytsia" who wrote "Scorpions" a pamphlet against Ukrainian emigration.

2. ROMANETS', Volodymyr - Ukrainian, male, lived in students dormitory in Moscow, Centr, Petrovericheskaya Peroulak 6/8, Room # 395, Tel. K 4-75-62,

his address in Kiev: Kiev 74,  
ul. Bolshaya Mostitskaya (Velyka Mostytska) No 23.

Student of engineering/?/, aged 28-30, 6'1, blue eyes, dark blond, long pointed chin somewhat hasty, and dreamy. His parents and sister live in Kiev.

He approached first HUNENKO, Maria at the Exposition in Moscow. HUNENKO introduced him to Subject. He seemed to be keenly interested in Ukrainian books, and Ukrainian affairs in general. He wanted to talk as often as possible with Subject and pretty soon began to speak in vague terms about his colleagues - molodtsi - who "act and work". He wanted also to see the books printed abroad and Subject showed him some at the Metro stations.

Subject did not trust him, however, ~~subject~~ particularly after Drach characterized him as "a good boy but one should not trust him fully".

ROMANETS' promised to introduce Subject in Kiev to some "molodtsi" - his friends and acquaintances - young poets and writers who have "zakhalavna" literature and want it to get abroad. He also mentioned that he had some elderly friends who returned from Siberia and who also want their works to be smuggled out abroad. However, when Subject met him in Kiev in Ivan HONCHAR'S office he showed no interest in fulfilling his promise but rather tried to "escape" her. On the whole he behaved much more reserved and differently than in Moscow. Second time in Kiev she bumped upon him at Shevchenko's Museum but he was again "different".

While in Moscow ROMANETS' promised Subject to give a list of people abroad "who are to be watched and eschewed".

he did not have this promise, either.

Subject, Ivan Mikorovich of Kiev, Ukrainian as before, called KOLANETS and said that he was at Honchar's office. KOLANETS brought him just a "zhurnar" from Moscow. From what she heard from Honchar she figured out that KOLANETS was doing a lot of travelling between Moscow and Kiev and had probably also something to do with "some commercial dealings" as well.

KOLANETS told Subject the following:

a/ During celebrations of Lesia Ukrainka anniversary in Lviv (Subject was not sure whether Lviv or Kiev but was more inclined to assume that this was Lviv) in 1963 students were forbidden to use a hall and in protest against authorities marched to the park with torches. There they started an anti-Russian demonstration. Militia tried to disperse them, some were arrested, one of organizers was sent to a mental asylum, and one was sent somewhere else and all traces of him lost.

b/ At one evening of young poets and actors in Kiev in 1963 one of young poets unexpectedly changed completely his program and had to be brought down by official orderlies. For his anti-Russian expressions he was arrested and sent to a place wherefrom he returned a completely changed man. "They broke him completely and he became a different man".

c/ In new developments in Jewish-Ukrainian relations: more and more Ukrainians and Jews begin to realize that they both are "beaten" by Russians and that their common enemy is Russian communism. Consequently, there is a trend to improve relations between the two groups and to help each other. In some cases Jewish individuals should even have helped financially each other.

d/ Subject asked Subject to get him "History of Ukraine" by Hruschovsky. He told him that he would try to get it for Lviv if he will put it into "good hands". If Subject cannot get it in Moscow he was ready to come personally or to send someone to Hruschovsky to pick it up.

...the ... .. " ... ..".

... .. he seemed to be very  
... .. on the ... .. several times that he ... ..  
... .. " ... ..", ... ..

3. <sup>17</sup>VOITSEKHOVSKIY, Bohdan P. - of Lviv, he gave Subject only "Glavpochtamt  
~~d.o.b. ca 1927~~ ~~1927~~ ~~1928~~ ~~Lives in Lviv - 1927~~ ~~Student~~  
do wostrebovaniya" in Lviv for the case she would want to contact him while  
the USSR. He promised to send his letters to Subject through a Slavko, Inu,  
a colleague of his living in Moscow.

VOITSEKHOVSKIY - Ukrainian, student of art in Lviv, aged 27, dark blond falling  
on the side hair, square face, aprox. 5'8; son of a Ukrainian catholic  
priest.

VOI. approached Subject at the Exposition in Moscow. He heard about her from his  
friend Slavko of Moscow. He simply wanted to talk to her as to a Ukrainian  
American, and came for that purpose to Moscow. After their first meeting

VOI. told Subject that there will come many other students from Lviv to  
see her. "All students in Lviv know about her" - as he put it. Indeed, Subject  
was approached by many Ukrainian students from Lviv who among other things asked  
her to lead them to the Library at the Exposition where they could read  
Ukrainian Encyclopedia and other books.

Subject met VOI two or three times outside of <sup>the</sup> Exposition. She also brought  
him in <sup>a</sup>taxi to the ~~Road~~ Road Station when he was leaving for Lviv.

VOI told Subject the following:

a/ There are very strong anti-Russian sentiments among students in Lviv.  
There were many squabbles between Russians and Ukrainians at the University  
and in parks. The main cause of squabbles was the insistence of Russian  
students to have all lectures in Russian instead of Ukrainian.  
Ukrainian students have "semi-illegal" circles in which they read "zakhalavna  
literatura", discuss various problems also. VOI assured Subject that national  
consciousness of young intelligentsia was very high and Russification had  
practically no impact on them.

b/ Recently increased remarkably anti-Russian sentiments in general.  
There are cases where Russians in Lviv have to wait longer for their meals than  
others. He gave it as an example of how Ukrainians repay for official

discrimination against them practiced by Russians in offices and public places.

Subject gave VOI 2 or 3 books in English on abstract art.

4. SOIKO, Bohdan of

Lviv, vul. Snopkovska 29/7  
c/o BOKOTY, Andrei Andriyovych  
~~NGARY~~  
Lviv 4, vul. Lysenka 22 b/4

SOIKO is one of Ukrainian young students that came from Lviv to Moscow to see Subject. She could not remember him, however, exactly and was not able to describe him. His address she had in her note-book.

5. VINOGRADOV Viktor Seostistovich of Moscow, Russian, aged 32-34, 5'10, *4.8.10 ca. 1931 in USSR*

oval face, dark brown hair; Russian writer and critic.

VINO ~~first~~ approached Subject at the exposition, once he left a message for her that he would like to talk to her, they met several times, he also used to keep Subject on telephone quite frequently.

VINO knew also when Subject was to leave Moscow and accompanied <sup>her</sup> for a part of the way to the Airport the Subject in her taxi. VINO agreed also to mail some medicine to SEKIV, Yulia of Belo Lubsha, r-n Zhydachiv, obl. Lviv, *201-736481* ~~which she was asked to deliver from Mrs KUFAS, fnu of New York, N.Y.~~

From the very beginning VINO directed all talk to such topics as art, abstractionism, socialist realism, basically defending official Soviet point of view. Finally he suggested to Subject that she should discard her present views about art and write a critique on abstractionism. He also suggested that she should remain in the Soviet Union and one day indicated that then she would have all the privileges of Soviet artists and writers like dacha, money, etc. On the side she could also lecture on English language and literature. Subject pretended that this was just a joke on his part but he made it then again clear to <sup>his</sup> her that "this was serious".

Among <sup>his</sup> "arguments" VINO used also the appeal to Subject's Slavic

originally giving her long lectures on Slavic solidarity, perfidy of Anglo-Saxons  
also. He made impression of a Russian chauvinist, panslavist, convinced  
that everything Russian is pure Slavic and therefore better and healthier  
anything and everything  
than ~~anything~~ from the West. As a Russian he is her brother as <sup>brother</sup> brother of all  
Ukrainians.

Otherwise, VINO was quite a sympathetic, friendly type, with wit and good manners.

6. \* KUZNETSOV, Ilya - Vice-Minister of Culture, Moscow (see picture).

asked at  
During an official visit to the Exposition he ~~approached~~ Subject's section  
"where is this Ukrainian girl?" and exchanged a few words in Ukrainian  
with Subject. Then added: "And indeed, khakhlachka" to what Subject replied  
"Then you are katsap". KUZ did not feel offended but rather seemed to like  
it. Afterwards Subject saw him at an official party at the US Embassy.  
KUZ was quite friendly and they discussed "Ukrainian problem". KUZ stuck  
to official line, i.e. Ukrainians have their state, they are free, the union  
with Russians is the best solution possible also.

7. \* BYCHKOV, Victor - Russian poet, aged approx. 25, <sup>born 1939</sup> gave Subject two of  
his poems. He approached her at the Exposition, too. Subject could only "vaguely  
recollect him".

8. \* KASIYAN, Vasil of Kiev 25,  
Volodymyrska 14, kv. 5  
Tel. K-11 B (Ukrainian) - 9-1006

<sup>artist</sup>  
known Ukrainian graphic, Ukrainian, male, was at that time in Moscow and  
visited the Exposition. He approached Subject and spoke quite freely though  
avoided controversial political topics. Subject gave him prospects, "America",  
and some other American magazines plus 5 or 6 books on graphics and modern art  
in general. He told her that he knew LYTYVYENKO who ~~he~~ he praised as a very  
talented sculptor. KAS was also of a very positive opinion about HOROZ and was  
very much interested in practical y all known <sup>Ukrainian</sup> painters and sculptors abroad.  
He asked Subject to send him at least photographs of their works.

KAS came to US Exposition to Moscow with 5 other artists and introduced them to Subject. They all were very eager to learn as much as possible about Western art, and particularly about their Ukrainian colleagues abroad. Whereas in Moscow they behaved quite freely and spoke the same way, in Kiev - as Subject ascertained later on during her stay in the Ukraine - all of them incl. KAS himself remarkably changed to the worse by being more restrained, sticking to official line also.

In Kiev KAS "took care" of Subject, introduced her to many other artists , showed her museums ,and was her guide in general. ~~Later~~ He used to pick her up by his car in the morning or as prearranged, took her to various places and had at least lunch if not dinner with her.

One day in Kiev he introduced her in his office to some of his colleagues who began to attack Western art and "Western decadency" in general but KAS himself did not participate in this "discussion". He rather tried to moderate the attacks of others, and then apologized for them before Subject.

Judging by the attitude of other artists toward KAS, <sup>he</sup> seemed to be some sort of boss for them in both artistic and administrative way .

In his Office KAS has <sup>a</sup> nice collection of Ukrainian graphics. He showed Subject also "Collection of Arkhipenko" which was given to him at the Art-  
in  
Exposition, Detroit.

9. ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ \* VERBA Ihor Ivanovych of Kiev,  
died ca. 1929 in USSR Ploshcha Kalinina,  
Ukrainian, artist, critic of art, aged 35, "right hand of KASIYAN", came together  
with the latter to Moscow, to US Exposition. While in Moscow was quite "human"  
and "freethinking" but changed completely in Kiev. He attacked very strongly  
Western decorative art. W<sup>nted</sup> to have same books on art that KAS got from  
Subject.

KIEV

1. Early January 1964 Subject left by plane for Kiev. She had no luck; the plane could not land because of bad weather and they returned to Moscow. Here the Aeroflot people wanted to take care of her by not letting her to go to her hotel in the city but by accommodating her in a room. Subject protested and after some argument went by taxi to her hotel. She was warned that she had to follow their instructions or she would have any trouble with authorities but finally let her go. On the way to the hotel in the city Subject's taxi was stopped by a militia patrol. The driver was fined for speeding and on this occasion also checked. In her opinion the militia patrol was probably checking for speeding and not on speeding.

2. A few days afterwards, Jan 1964, Subject came to Kiev again, this time together with Hnenkos. They stayed in a hotel "Slova", on 4th floor. Their sojourn in Kiev lasted a few days before their departure by plane back to Moscow. After supper at the hotel Subject drank champagne and went upstairs to her room. She felt very ill, had headaches, started vomiting, felt very dizzy and was balancing in her room from one wall to the other every time. She called Hnenkos and they called a doctor. He wanted to take Subject to hospital. She refused. Hnenkos phoned to Moscow and were told to stay in Kiev. Once to Moscow. Next day they all three left Kiev. There Subject was examined by an American doctor who was unable to find out what was the cause of Subject's illness.

3. While in Kiev Subject rested in a room like KASTYAN and his friends. In her

surveillance in Kiev . Some people were always following her either afoot or by car, or both. Subject expected DRACH to come to Kiev but he did not arrive. Her attempts to contact his friends failed and she thought it was OK to talk at least to MARCHENKO Oleksiy. She thinks he was just naive and there was nothing suspicious about him.

Sovs Subject not in Kiev

Subject was introduced by KASIYAN to many people in Kiev but she could not remember them except for a few. Among them:

1. HONCHAR Ivan Makarovych of Kiev,  
Novo-Navodnytska Sa,

a young Ukrainian sculptor, hard working, socia/ble, pretended not to be interested in politics. Asked, however, quite a few questions about Ukrainian artists abroad, preparations for Shevchenko celebrations, and Ukrainian emigration in general.

2. BRATERSKYI - Ukrainian sculptor, recommended to Subject by Kasiyan as one of better ones in Kiev.

3. KALCHENKO Halyna Nikiforovna - Ukrainian artist; highly recommended by KASIYAN; of Kiev, too.

4. A student of architecture, approx. age : 26-28, approached Subject at a restaurant, told her that he had a lot to talk about with her but never came again. Did not give his name.

YEREVAN

1. After her return from Kiev Subject stayed for two days or so in Moscow and then joined her <sup>group</sup> in YEREVAN in January 1964. There she worked as guide at the US Exposition until her departure to Moscow in March 1964. Around 15 March she arrived from Moscow via Warsaw by Aeroflot (Moscow - Warsaw) and Austrian Airlines (Warsaw - Vienna) to Vienna, Austria. From Vienna she proceeded to Paris.

2. On the whole Subject had a very sympathetic public in YEREVAN. Armenians showed warm interest in American Exposition and did not conceal their enthusiasm about everything American. Subject met also representatives of Armenian repatriates from the States. All complained about their foolish decision in the past and wished to get a chance to return to the USA again. She was told that <sup>the</sup> for ~~last~~ ~~years~~ one or two years they abandoned their efforts to get re-repatriated to the States but still hoped to get there eventually. They told Subject that whereas all repatriates before 1962 were taken everything away on their arrival in Armenia, those repatriated after 1962 could keep their belongings. Particularly severe in their critique of Soviet system were young repatriates.

3. In YEREVAN Subject made quite a few friends. Among them was also a YURIY, lnu, Armenian, aged approx. 30, sociable. He spoke English, studied mathematics, visited Europe (Paris, London), claimed to have relatives in the USA. One day he asked Subject to dine with him. They went to a restaurant, YURIY asked Subject to convey his greetings to his relatives in the States, and on the way home ~~wanted~~ wanted to introduce Subject to his parents. It turned out however that he had something else in mind and instead of introducing her to parents and giving her the address of his relatives in the States, wanted to rape her. Subject did not think, however, that this was necessarily arranged

by the KGB though she did not exclude such a probability either.

-IV A-

Sovs Subject met in Yerevan!

1. TARYAN, Ruben of Yerevan 18,  
Ortiabrdzvi Prospekt 23, kv.16,

Armenian, male, aged 30-32, graphic, his father was a famous sculptor. TAR came often to the Exposition, was very keenly interested in modern art, did not try to conceal his sympathy for it, and wanted to have books on it. One day he did not come though promised to do so and one or two suspicious types asked Subject if she had something for him because he did not feel well and could not come himself.

2. DROZMIN, Andrei Borysovich - of Yerevan', refused to give his address, Russian, male, aged 30, claimed to be born in Lviv, West Ukraine, married, his wife is an artist, spoke very fine Ukrainian, showed great interest in Ukrainian literature, asked for Western records and literature. His wife ~~was going~~ - according to DRO - wanted to get to Poland to get acquainted with present modern trends in Polish art. He seemed to be somewhat suspicious to Subject and she did not trust him.

3. \*AKOPYAN, Gresha of Yerevan,  
ul. Alvardiana # 55,  
d.o.b. ca. 1939  
Armenian, female, aged 25, 5'5, very attractive, KGB agent, was "working" on male guides. Usually she was accompanied by two other helpers when came to the Exposition.

SECRET  
105  
97  
1/3

SECRET

Ad DRACH, Iven:

1. Drach was of a rather skeptical opinion about YEVTUSHENKO, both as a poet and as human character. In his opinion he owed very much to his first wife ANNIADULINA ( now publishes in "Yunost'") who was much stronger in poetry than YEVTUSHENKO himself. As a human character - in DRACH'S opinion - YEVTUSHENKO gave up to pressures of the party and complied with their demands more or less.
2. DRACH was very positive about NEKRASOV, he liked GOGOL, PULSKYI was great at one time but then gave in; he liked MAYAKOVSKYI , less YESENIN, and liked the style of DOSTOYEVSKYI though he was too depressive for him.

SECRET